1 (Case called)

2.3

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Will the parties please state your names for the record.

MS. LaMORTE: Good morning, your Honor. Tara LaMorte for the government. With me at counsel table is Daniel Tracer, also for the government.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. BRICKFIELD: Paul Brickfield for Edward Shin.

THE COURT: Good morning. Thank you very much for being here.

I understand the defendant has already been arraigned before the assigned magistrate judge. As a result, my agenda for this conference is relatively straightforward.

I expect to hear from the United States about the nature of the charges. I've read the complaint and the other documents on the docket. I want to talk about discovery and to set a schedule for discovery. And then I hope to set a schedule for next steps in the case based on that information.

So with that introduction, counsel for the United States, what can you tell me about the nature of this case.

MS. LaMORTE: Sure, your Honor. This case involves several fraud schemes that were perpetrated by the defendant while he was the CEO of a bank. Those schemes were designed to line his pocket while at the same time they put the bank at

1 risk.

2.3

The bank at issue is the Noah Bank. It's a regional bank that caters to the Korean community. It's headquartered in Pennsylvania, and it has offices in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey.

During the relevant time period in this case, which was 2009 to 2012, a good portion of the bank's business involved issuing SBA-quaranteed loans.

As the Court may be aware, SBA is the Small Business Administration. It's a government agency that's charged with helping small businesses get off the ground and succeed. To that end, they will guarantee loans that are issued by commercial lenders, including Noah Bank.

So it's not a direct lender. It will just guarantee a loan. Obviously there are rules and regulations, however, that govern when the SBA is willing to guarantee a commercial loan to a small business.

Now, a good portion of Noah Bank's business involved issuing these SBA loans. And the defendant's fraud scheme revolved around the bank's issuance of these loans in violation of SBA rules and regulations.

And obviously the SBA does not guarantee or may not guarantee these loans if its rules and regulations are not followed which are designed for a number of reasons, but primarily to ensure the soundness of the loan and that it's

J8€¥\$€19-cr-00552-GHW Document 19 Filed 09/19/19 Page 4 of 20

1 | being used for proper purposes.

So the charges that we have involve primarily around two schemes. One involves an SBA rule that precludes employees or officers of a bank from having an interest in a company that is the recipient of an SBA loan.

And here in this case, the defendant, the CEO of the bank, was involved in the issuance of SBA loans to companies in which he secretly held an ownership interest which was not disclosed to the SBA.

I should add that while this case primarily revolves around SBA loans, this conduct, which I'm describing also occurred in connection with the bank's commercial loan activity.

The second scheme involved broker fees. So under SBA rules and regulations, the bank is precluded from paying out broker fees, but a borrower who uses a broker in connection with getting a loan from a bank may pay the broker a fee.

So in this case, there was a particular individual who served as a broker to bring small businesses to Noah Bank to get SBA loans. What would happen then was that person was paid a broker fee for his work in connection with the brokering activity and had an arrangement, a secret arrangement, with the defendant in which a portion of that broker fee would be kicked back as a bribe to the defendant to be able to continue to do business with the bank.

This occurred both in connection with loans, SBA loans, in which the person, the individual at issue, did in fact perform broker work, but also it occurred in connection with SBA loans where the individual did not perform any broker work. The loan documentation was made to look like there was a broker involved in the transaction.

In those cases, the bank would issue a broker's fee, and the individual would pay the defendant a portion of that broker fee, again, as a bribe or a kickback. So those are sort of the main schemes that are involved.

Then the indictment that we have charges four counts. The first is conspiracy to commit wire fraud affecting a financial institution. And that just, as a general matter, involves causing the SBA to guarantee loans and concealing the fact that those loans were issued in violation of SBA rules and regulations.

The second count charges conspiracy to commit bank bribery. And this involves the agreement to accept the kickback or the bribe payment from that individual who was receiving broker fees.

The third is a substantive bank bribery count. And the fourth count is theft embezzlement or misapplication by a bank officer, again involving the broker activity. So those are the four counts that we have in the indictment now.

I will add that I would say sometime within the next

So the discovery is voluminous I will say. We have about 11 gigabytes that we are about to be ready to produce to the defendant, either by the end of this week or early next week. That's about I believe 80,000 pages or so. So there are

24

25

2.3

thousands of documents involved.

A lot of these documents we obtained from Noah Bank.

So there are a lot of documents that pertain to a count information from various individuals and entities that we named for whose account statements and other information we wanted.

There are a number of loan files that are involved with respect to the various loans that we contend are problematic. We have communications relating to these loan entities and individuals. So email communications and communications with the SBA.

Then finally we have -- again, this is the bucket of information from the bank. We have SBA forms, documents, and communications between the bank and the SBA.

There are two warrants that are at issue in this case. One, we obtained a warrant for the defendant's Hotmail account for a finite period of time. So we will produce obviously that warrant affidavit and all of the emails that we obtained from that warrant.

And then the second, we executed a search warrant on the defendant's business office and the bank. And from there, we obtained I want to say approximately ten boxes of hard-copy files, as well as imaged the defendant's business computer. So all of that obviously will also be provided to the defendant.

Then finally, the last bucket of discoverable information is from subpoena returns from phone companies and

J8€¥\$€19-cr-00552-GHW Document 19 Filed 09/19/19 Page 8 of 20

other banks. So some of our entities and individuals also banked at other institutions. And we obtained that banking information.

THE COURT: Thank you.

2.3

I understand that the government has imaged the defendant's computer and seized other records.

At what point do you expect that you will be identifying to the defense the documents or records that you believe are responsive to the warrant?

MS. LaMORTE: One moment, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Government counsel conferred)

MS. LaMORTE: Your Honor, with respect to the warrant we executed for the email, we are prepared to do that immediately in terms of identifying what is responsive to the warrant.

For the documents and the computer that we seized from the business office, we're going to need a bit more time. It's primarily logistical. So for those boxes, we had to send them out to a vendor to get uploaded and then scanned and then put into a relativity database for the privilege review that is happening. So I would say 30 days for that.

THE COURT: Thank you. Good. That's very helpful.

Counsel for defendant, you've heard the government's expectations regarding timing for production of the broad swath

of discovery, as well as identification of the specific records that they assert are responsive to the warrant.

Given that schedule for production of discovery which

I expect the government will meet, what's your proposal

regarding next steps in the case?

MR. BRICKFIELD: Your Honor, I think we're going to need probably at least 90 days to review this. I don't know if the 80,000 is the total amount of pages or just not counting the emails and search warrants and the boxes from my client's office.

So even 80,000 is a quite substantial number. And obviously we have an obligation to review each and every document. I imagine many of them are not particularly relevant, but I would say we're going to need at least 90 days from receipt of all these documents to do a review of them.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So your proposal then is that we have a separate conference in approximately four months from now at which point you anticipate that you will have completed your review of the discovery and will be prepared to talk to the Court and the government about a motion schedule?

MR. BRICKFIELD: I don't want to commit to that, that it will be done in 90 days. Again, I haven't seen a single document yet. Assuming that it's in that range, it may take longer than that.

2.3

I think we can set, if your Honor wishes, a conference in four months. I guess I can advise the Court along the way the progress we're making because that is a lot of documents.

My last case had 75,000 documents. That took the entire summer for my office to review. So I'm thinking three months for 80,000 documents. Again, I don't want to be locked into a 90-day schedule when I haven't seen a single document yet. That's what I'm trying to say.

THE COURT: Thank you. Good.

I understand that the defense is asking for approximately 90 days following the production of the records to the defense. I understand that the government will have completed that work no later than 30 days from now.

As a result, I'm going to propose to grant the defendant's request and to schedule a conference for approximately four months from now. My hope and expectation is that by that point, the defense will have had the opportunity to review the discovery that's been produced and it will be in a position at that conference to set a motion schedule and potentially a trial schedule as appropriate.

If any party believes that an adjournment is warranted, you should make a request for one in accordance with my individual rules of practice in criminal cases.

Counsel for defendant, is that an acceptable construction of your request?

J&SHT. 19-cr-00552-GHW Document 19 Filed 09/19/19 Page 11 of 20 11 1 MR. BRICKFIELD: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Good. Thank you. 2 Counsel for the United States, what's your view 3 4 regarding that proposal? 5 MS. LaMORTE: The United States has no objection to that proposal, your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 8 So I'll set a date approximately four months from now, 9 at which point I expect that the defense will be prepared to 10 tell me what motions the defendant is contemplating. We'll then set a motion schedule, a hearing schedule if necessary, 11 and possibly a trial date. 12 13 Again, to the extent that a party believes that an 14 additional period of time is warranted, you should feel free to 15 reach out to the Court to request an extension of time in 16 accordance with my individual rules. 17

Mr. Daniels, can you please propose a date.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Tuesday, December 17, at 4:00 p.m.

THE COURT: Thank you.

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. BRICKFIELD: Judge, I'm going to be away that day. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: That's fine. Do you have a preferred alternative date later that week?

MR. BRICKFIELD: I'm going to be away that whole week, your Honor. Sorry.

(212) 805-0300

THE COURT: Please.

25

2.3

MR. BRICKFIELD: The first is I had sent the government on August 5, which was several days after the arraignment, a request for a bill of particulars as the government has advised me in various meetings that they believe there are 24 to 30 loans. But the indictment does not specify any loans by name or particularity.

I understand from the government, when I spoke to them yesterday, that they will be superseding. I don't know if that information will be revealed. So I'd like to reserve the right under Rule 7(f) to file a motion for a bill of particulars after the receipt of the superseding indictment.

The rule requires it to be 14 days after arraignment or such other time as the Court permits. I think this is a case where a bill of particulars, perhaps after discovery and the superseding indictment, would make more sense because I think there is nothing in the indictment itself that indicates which particular loans allegedly there were kickbacks on and so on and so forth.

I did send them the letter. That's what they responded to me. I'm asking the Court for leave to file that motion, if necessary, at a later date.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Counsel for the United States, let me hear from you, and then I'll comment.

MS. LaMORTE: Sure, your Honor. I believe that the

2.3

bill of particulars that the defendant had submitted to us will in fact be most upon the time that we supersede.

I understand in many cases where we receive a bill of particulars, we will work with the defendant to discuss and discuss sort of the scope of the case and which loans are at issue and issues like that.

So we anticipate that once we supersede, in the event that the defense provides us with another letter, we will endeavor to confer with the defense on the various issues such as the loans that are at issue.

THE COURT: Good. Thank you very much.

So I hope that the parties will continue to discuss this issue. I understand that the government's superseding indictment may provide additional detail.

In any event, to directly address the defendant's request here, I am happy to entertain an application for a bill of particulars that would be made in conjunction with the other Rule 12 motions.

I expect that we'd set a briefing schedule for any application of a bill of particulars at our next conference and that I would take up any such application then.

So with respect to the referenced 7(f), I'm granting you leave to file such a bill of particulars in conjunction with the other Rule 12 motions that I expect we will be scheduling at our next conference.

1 MR. BRICKFIELD: Thank you, your Honor.

2 | THE COURT: Good. Thank you.

2.3

MR. BRICKFIELD: Your Honor, just one additional matter, which I've also discussed this with the government. My client on his conditions of release — his travel is restricted to the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District, and the Eastern District of Pennsylvania where he resides with his wife.

He has a daughter who attends Penn State. That's in the Middle District of Pennsylvania. I've asked the government if they would consent to my request to have travel there. I believe they have consented to that.

When I spoke with his pretrial officer, Carrie Foster, who is in Philadelphia, she said, why don't you see if the judge will give him permission to travel throughout the United States with permission from pretrial without having to come back and add this district or that district, as my client has lost his job at the bank following his indictment and is hopeful to engage in some consulting business and may need to travel around the United States.

So I asked the United States what their position was on that, and they said they were going to advise me today.

THE COURT: Thank you. Give me a moment, please.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Counsel, first, thank you very much. I

J&X&H:19-cr-00552-GHW Document 19 Filed 09/19/19 Page 16 of 20

1 | will hear from the United States momentarily.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

I don't have a copy of the defendant's pretrial services report that was presented to the magistrate judge.

Do either of the parties have it with them?

MS. LaMORTE: We're not permitted to retain a copy, your Honor.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ BRICKFIELD: They collect them at the end of the hearing.

THE COURT: Given that I don't have that information available, I'm going to decline to take action with respect to this request at this time. I will happily entertain an application from the defendant with respect to potential modification of the terms of his pretrial release. I need to review additional information in order to make a determination that such a blanket permission for travel is warranted here.

With respect to the request that the defendant be permitted to travel to the Middle District of Pennsylvania to visit his daughter at Penn State, can I ask: How frequent do you anticipate that travel to be?

MR. BRICKFIELD: Just a moment, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Please take your time.

(Defendant and counsel conferred)

MR. BRICKFIELD: My client indicates that would be approximately once a month, your Honor.

THE COURT: Once a month?

1 MR. BRICKFIELD: Yes.

2 | THE COURT: Thank you.

2.3

Counsel for the --

MR. BRICKFIELD: She's a senior at the school, and she does have certain conditions resulting from an assault that she suffered at the school. So her parents keep her close, and they'd like to be able to go see her on a regular basis.

THE COURT: Thank you. I'm sorry to hear that.

Counsel for the United States, what's the government's position regarding the defendant's request that I modify the conditions of his pretrial release to permit him to travel to the Middle District of Pennsylvania?

MS. LaMORTE: The government does not object to that, so long as there's advance notice provided to pretrial and the government before each particular visit.

THE COURT: Thank you. Fine.

I will modify the defendant's conditions of pretrial release to permit the defendant to travel to the Middle District of Pennsylvania, provided that he provides prior notice to his pretrial services officer and the pretrial services officer is also alerted when he returns to one of the already permitted districts, namely, the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the Southern District of New York, and the Eastern District of New York.

So, again, I'll modify the conditions of the

2.3

defendant's pretrial release to permit him to travel to the Middle District of Pennsylvania with the prior approval of his pretrial services officer.

I understand that his pretrial supervision is being supervised in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and they will be able to communicate with him regarding any potential travel there.

To the extent that the defendant has an application for a broader extension of his opportunity to travel nationwide, you should make a written application to the Court providing the position of the pretrial services office and the United States. And I'll evaluate that request after reviewing the information prepared by pretrial services.

Good. Anything else that we should take up now? Counsel for defendant?

MR. BRICKFIELD: No. Thank you for your time, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Counsel for the United States, is there an application with respect to the speedy trial clock?

MS. LaMORTE: Yes, your Honor. The government would move to exclude time between today and the next conference.

The reason we would do that is given the voluminous nature of the discovery and the time that the defendant will require to review it and to determine what motions he may have, the ends

of justice served by the continuance outweigh the defendant's right and the public's interest in a speedy trial.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Counsel for the defendant, what's your position?

MR. BRICKFIELD: We consent to that, your Honor.

Thank you.

2.3

THE COURT: Thank you.

I will exclude time from today until January 7, 2020. After balancing the factors specified in 18 U.S. Code, Section 3161(h)(7), I find that the ends of justice served by excluding such time outweigh the interests of the defendant and the public in a speedy trial because it will provide time for production of the voluminous discovery and review of those materials by the defendant and also because it will allow the defendant time to consider and prepare any motions, as well as for the parties to continue to discuss a potential issue related to motion practice regarding a bill of particulars.

Good. Anything else that we should take up before we adjourn? Counsel for the United States?

MS. LaMORTE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. Thank you.

Counsel for the defendant?

MR. BRICKFIELD: No, your Honor. I just wanted to explain briefly that I had explained to my client the speedy trial. He has consented to that exception and also just to

note that we have entered pleas of not guilty.

I'm not going to go through the government's version of the offense, but those are merely allegations. And obviously my client maintains his innocence in this particular case.

THE COURT: Understood. Good. Thank you very much. This proceeding is adjourned.

(Adjourned)